DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 119 HE 013 603

AUTHOR Stordahl, Barbara
TITLE Faculty Development: A Survey of Literature of the '70s. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents, March 1981.
INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 5p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036 ($.75).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Individual Development; *Instructional Improvement; Peer Evaluation; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Role; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

The need for faculty development, approaches to faculty development, and 16 postulates for a successful faculty development program are examined, based on a survey of literature of the 1970s. Among the reasons faculty development is needed are the following: decreased faculty mobility caused by declining university enrollments, financial problems that require more efficient use of existing faculty, and the lack of awareness of the variety and sophistication of instructional methods available for classroom use. Approaches to faculty development range from the independent review by faculty members of their own courses and methods and attempts to make changes to emphasize the systematic design and implementation of instruction. Other approaches include the political approach, the educational research approach, and the interinstitutional approach. Assertiveness training workshops and growth contracts are methods by which faculty members can become involved in their own development. Postulates for a successful program include the following: provide an acceptable rationale for why the faculty development program is needed, involve the faculty in planning, balance institutional priorities and individual needs, make participation voluntary, include part-time faculty, reward participation, publicize the program adequately, evaluate the results, and provide adequate funding. A bibliography is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

RESEARCH CURRENTS

MARCH 1981
AAHE-ERIC/HIGHER EDUCATION

ED200119

Faculty development: a survey of literature of the '70s

Barbara Stordahl

Prior to the 1970s faculty development was of little concern to either college and university faculties or to their administrations. On most campuses development was limited to such things as orientation of new faculty, sabbatical leaves, visiting professorships, and, perhaps, reductions of class loads. A survey of literature in that period would have turned up a limited number of articles on the topic. Times have changed, however, and in the last ten years faculty development has become the focus of a growing number of research proposals, projects, articles, and books.

Definitions of faculty development

Francis (1975) defines faculty development as,

> an institutional process which seeks to modify the attitudes, skills, and behavior of faculty members toward greater competence and effectiveness in meeting student needs, their own needs and the needs of the institution. (p. 720)

Gaff (1976) lists a number of expectations people have for faculty development. For example, some believe that stimulating and furthering the growth of faculty members is what faculty development should be about. Others see it as a means to improve the education of students or to strengthen the institution, preserve high standards, and promote the advancement of knowledge. Some hope for the development of new roles for faculty members in innovative settings. Many emphasize classroom techniques and skills (Davis 1979; Ferren and White 1977; Goldman 1978; Marty 1976; Mullally and Duffy 1978; Wergin, Mason, and Munson 1976).

The phrase *faculty development* has some unfortunate connotations, however. Some see it as anti-professional, some even see it as anti-intellectual. Just as no people want to be colonized, neither do faculties like to be "developed." Gerth (1973) has suggested that *faculty support* or *faculty growth* would be better terms because faculty members would view the terms and perhaps, then, the programs as supportive rather than as controlling.

Need for development

Whatever the definition, whatever the expectation, the general consensus is that colleges and universities need faculty development. They need it for a number of reasons: (1) There has been a decrease in faculty mobility caused by declining enrollments in colleges and universities. With less turnover and less new blood, colleges no longer can depend on new staff to help keep them vital (Centra 1978a). (2) Financial stringencies in colleges and universities are generating pressures for more efficient use of existing faculty (Kramer 1979). (3) Faculty members are not able to use nor are they often aware of the variety and sophistication of instructional methods that are available for classroom use. (Kosma, Belle, and Williams 1978). (4) Increasing heterogeneity of the college student population has increased the pressure on faculty to be more flexible and more productive. (5) There has been a general disenchantment—expressed by students, parents, and legislators—with the quality of the educational product (Centra 1978a). Demands are becoming more and more strident for accountability (Wergin, Mason, and Munson 1976; Smith and Ovard 1979). (6) Currently faculty members are isolated because of the competitiveness of research and publishing plus the solitary process of teaching. At the same time they face rapid change and have no means of dealing with that change in concert with others.

Approaches to faculty development

In an attempt to meet these pressing needs, more than 50 percent of the accredited two- and four-year colleges and universities in the United States have established programs or practices for faculty renewal and the improvement of instruction (Jabker and Halinski 1978). Probably no two programs and projects are just alike.

They range in complexity from the totally independent, individualistic approach in which faculty members review their own courses and their own methods and attempt to make changes (Gaff 1978b) to a theoretical model described by Webb and Smith (1976-77) that emphasizes the systematic design and implementation of instruction, the point of interaction between the learner and the curriculum.

Somewhere between these two approaches are a variety of others including the political approach, the educational research approach, and the organic mode employed by PIRIT (Project on Institutional Renewal Through Improvement of Teaching), all described by Gaff (1978b), the interinstitutional approach written about by Linden (1976-77), and the scholarship and personal growth models of Webb and Smith (1976-77).

Of all the approaches, the inquiry method of faculty development seems to have the most promise. Inquiry programs do not stress directly the acquisition of particular kinds of knowledge, but rather, stress skill in discovering and then articulating personal dissatisfaction with one's effectiveness in the classroom. Once faculty members learn to recognize discrepancies between their intentions and their practices, they then can determine for themselves what they need to learn and, ultimately, how much to learn (Connell, Alberti, and Piotrowski 1976-77).

Each of the various models or approaches to faculty development can embrace any number of individual components. One type mentioned repeatedly in the literature was the personal development/personal involvement component. Authors seemed to agree that the problems faculty members have in their personal lives have a direct bearing on their effectiveness as professors and personal involvement by faculty members provides motivation as well as assurance that individual needs will be met. Program components aimed at personal involvement and development include workshops on assertiveness training and anxiety reduction (Stice 1976-77), "process facilitators" who act as catalysts and guides in generating information about needed changes and possible solutions (Lindquist 1978), and faculty interviews that stimulate faculty to reflect on their own development and institutional situation (Freedman 1973).

Growth contracts provide another method by which faculty members can become involved in their own development. A contract is developed by a professor, usually with the assistance of a consultant, that specifies the personal and professional goals that the faculty member has set for himself or herself, the methods to be used for achievement, and the schedule to be followed. Centra (1977a) writes that a majority of respondents in a national survey consider growth contracts effective because they build on strengths and eliminate the weaknesses of faculty members on an individual basis and are less threatening than formal ratings by colleagues or administrators.

Some types of peer observation, however, have been successfully integrated into faculty development programs (Bell, Dobson, and Gram 1977). They include: (1) triads or three-member teams working together to assess members' teaching performance (Redditt and Hamilton 1978; Sweeney and Grasha 1979), (2) faculty diagnostic teams (Bergquist and Phillips 1975b), (3) master teachers, who can evaluate teaching and demonstrate new and perhaps more effective methods, and (4) faculty exchanges (Centra 1977a).

Although the assumption is that faculty development will benefit

Research Currents is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinion, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either AAHE or the National Institute of Education.

Copies of Research Currents may be ordered for 75¢ each (including postage and handling) from the American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

HE 013 603

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

students, some development programs involve students in a more direct way. In some cases students have been polled to discover their preferences for various teaching methods and the effectiveness of attempted changes (Gaff 1978a). Questionnaires such as the Teaching Analysis By Students (TABS) form have been distributed to students to help identify teaching strengths and problems among professors and to measure perceptions of qualitative changes in teaching performance (Erickson and Erickson 1979). Some institutions have included students in planning teams that work to improve teaching and learning campuswide (Gaff 1978a).

Academic advising is another possible component of a faculty development program. For example, at Otterbein a cadre of students was recruited and trained to take care of the routine types of academic advising. This "peer advising" was supplemented by faculty advising on more complex problems of long-range academic or career planning (Redditt and Hamilton 1978). Kramer (1979) proposed a unique approach to academic advising that would give faculty members advice about the models for advising as well as give students personal support and assistance.

Implementation

Another important aspect of faculty development is the implementation—what can be done to make a program succeed. Hammons and Wallace (1976) list, in an article titled "Sixteen Ways to Kill a College Faculty Development Program," a number of activities that will lead a program to failure. Rewording their points in the positive and drawing from some other sources yields 16 postulates for a successful faculty development program.

Postulate 1: Provide an acceptable rationale for why a faculty development program is needed. Many faculty members do not feel they need to be developed. They see themselves as effective teachers or at least as knowing how to be if they were just given the necessary time, equipment, and support. For example, the response to a questionnaire sent to the faculty of the University of Nebraska indicated teachers are quite happy with their teaching performance. Of the faculty who responded, 68 percent rated themselves in the top quarter on teaching performance, 94 percent rated themselves as above-average teachers, 60 percent were satisfied with the quality of undergraduate instruction in their departments, and a mere 5 percent were dissatisfied with their teaching most of the time. A good number of faculty members believe that teachers are born not made, that teaching is an art and not a science, and that the professor's classroom is his or her castle (Gaff 1978b). Such beliefs do not lead to professors seeing a need for development. Assessment of teaching must be made through student evaluations, self-evaluation, and peer evaluations (Bergquist and Phillips 1975a) in order to convince teachers that a discrepancy exists between their view and actual teaching effectiveness. Once convinced, they will be able to accept the need.

Additionally, the need for a development program must be perceived as greater than the personal needs of the faculty member. Bloom and Freedman (1973) claim that the childhood and youth of professors predisposes them to select academic careers. The academic culture tends to meet basic psychological needs of these people, and they tend to take a conservative stance rather than risk the uncertain outcomes of innovation. If a faculty member's needs and the proposed changes are very far apart, the changes will be perceived as a threat and will be resisted.

Faculty members also are threatened by the new self-definition required; by the substantial investments in time, energy and worry; by fear of failure; and by not knowing what to look for as evidence of success (Noonan 1973; Freedman and Sanford 1973).

Postulate 2: Assign responsibility and authority for planning. Because faculty development tends to lie at the periphery of the university and is viewed as temporary and experimental; because faculty development programs generally serve a number of different publics—faculty, administration, foundations, legislatures, and students; and because faculty development programs must compete with other uses for faculty time (Wergin 1977), it is essential that the responsibility and authority for planning be designated. Without that assignment the planning is not likely to get done, and without planning no program will attract either funds or participants.

Postulate 3: Involve the faculty in planning. Lindquist (1978) believes that humans are, or can be helped to be, problem solvers; that real changes in human knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors are not likely unless they are "my" solutions to "my" problems in pursuit of "my" goals. By involving faculty members in the planning and by encouraging them to be a part of the administration of the program, the ownership of the program rests with the faculty (Redditt and Hamilton 1978). This type of ownership builds commitment and a sense of responsibility for and to the program.

Postulate 4: Provide sufficient flexibility. A program must be diverse enough to meet the varied needs of professors. What troubles one person may not trouble a colleague. Additionally, the individual needs and ambitions of faculty members are different at different career stages. For example, beginning faculty members are more interested in and have a greater need for scholarship development and building their professional reputations. Economic considerations are also important.

By mid-career the intensely competitive, scholarly career may not look so attractive as it once did, and faculty members simply may begin to tire. Professors at this stage in their career are more concerned with personal rather than professional relationships, with immediate satisfactions, with a more concrete example of what scholarship can do for them and for their community. In fact, at this time some faculty members may choose to move into public service positions if the school provides such vehicles for transition (Bess 1975).

In later years needs for development are again different. A faculty member may become stale, bored, the "dead wood" of the department, or may have been shunted into the background by more aggressive young faculty members. He or she will need encouragement to update and reengage or perhaps move out through an early retirement system (Patton 1978; Baratz 1978).

Postulate 5: Balance institutional priorities and individual needs. Just as a program cannot consider only the needs of individuals without concern for the effect on the institution, neither can a program meet only the needs of the college or university without regard for those people who make up the faculty. Both are interdependent, both need development.

Postulate 6: Make participation voluntary. Several authors have pointed to the voluntary nature of their programs as one of the keys to success (Hoyt and Howard 1978; Davis 1979; Nyquist 1978; Ferren and White 1977). Knowles, a theorist in adult education, advances two premises relevant to the need for voluntary programs. The first is that men and women become more mature as they grow older, and, as they do so, become more secure and self-directing. The second premise is, if they are placed in a situation that threatens that self-directing process, they will become resistant and resentful. Adults learn because they need to learn, not because someone tells them they should.

Postulate 7: Administrative staff should support and participate in developmental activities. They can do this by attending workshops, seminars, and team meetings; by making secretarial help available; by disseminating information about teaching and development; and by providing adequate funding for development programs (Redditt and Hamilton 1978).

Postulate 8: Include part-time faculty. Faculty members, both full- and part-time, are the most important educational resource of a college or university. Just as material resources must be given special care and attention to retain or enhance their value, so must the tal-

Barbara Stordahl was formerly an instructor with the College of Great Falls.

ents, interests, and skills of the entire faculty be systematically cultivated (Eble 1971).

Postulate 9: Reward participation. Many believe that teaching is its own reward and point to various job satisfaction studies in which faculty members indicate that their relationship with students is a major source of satisfaction. There are some teaching awards such as the Harvison Distinguished Teaching Award program of the Danforth Foundation and numerous local college and university awards for teaching. Other rewards, financial and nonfinancial, include recognition, leadership positions, promotions (Redditt and Hamilton 1978), pay increases, released time, opportunities to visit other colleges, and funds to attend conferences and workshops. Jabker and Halinski (1978) conducted a study at Illinois State University on the benefits and rewards accrued by faculty members who participated in an instructional development program. Their findings supported the hypothesis that the success of instructional development programs is contingent on an effective reward system. Consequently, they concluded that,

> A large percentage of the faculty, especially at the assistant and associate professor levels, . . . [will] devote more of their energy to research and scholarly productivity than to the improvement of instruction as long as the "publish or perish" policies are enforced and differential salary increments for meritorious teaching are minimal (p. 328).

Postulate 10: Exercise common sense in scheduling development programs and provide continuity in the program. Classroom preparation, teaching, committee work, advising, research, and writing all claim time from the faculty member. If a development program is going to receive a share of those precious hours, it must be scheduled sensibly.

In addition to a sensible schedule, a development program needs continuity. It should begin in graduate schools where, ideally, as much attention is given to the development of teachers as to the development of scholars. At present, graduate training rarely includes preparation for teaching roles. "In fact, it has been said that professors get jobs by demonstrating they they have been taught, not that they can teach" (Gaff 1978b). From a solid foundation in graduate school, development should continue with an orientation program for new faculty, a special program for beginning teachers that would include reduced work loads and varied experiences, to an ongoing program for all career levels of faculty members (Eble 1971).

Postulate 11: Consider the instructional techniques to be used in the program. Once faculty members have seen a need for development and have volunteered to do something about meeting that need, they have to know how to go about it. That requires a center of some sort to provide ideas, models, encouragement, and interested, but detached, professional service (Stice 1976-77).

Postulate 12: Mix internal and external resources. External resources can provide the incentive to get a program off the ground and the expertise for various technical aspects, but no school should rely totally on outsiders. If the program is going to work, it must be owned by the participants, which means that internal resources must play an important part.

Postulate 13: Publicize the program adequately. In order to involve the faculty in a program of development, they must be informed about the program's goals and methods, who is eligible to participate, how one goes about participating, where one goes to obtain materials or assistance, and what the rewards are for participation. This information can be disseminated through office memos, department meetings, school newspapers, bulletin board announcements, and direct mailings.

Postulate 14: Evaluate the results. There is relatively little information concerning the effectiveness of faculty development programs at the present time (Mayo 1979); the literature is extremely sparse and the studies reported uncommonly simplistic (Hoyt and Howard 1978). As a consequence, it is particularly important for development programs to include an evaluation component. One widely used model for evaluation that might be helpful is CIPP (Context-Input-Process-Product) developed by Stufflebeam and colleagues. In their model, context determines program objectives. It consists of "consumer" criteria, "competitor" criteria, and environmental factors. The input includes alternative plans and strategies; the process monitors implementation; and the product measures and interprets both short- and long-term effects (Wergin 1977).

A number of other evaluation techniques could be and have been applied to faculty development programs. One is the experimental design method, a technique that lays out treatment and control in order to determine outcome. Such an approach can be used for examining small portions of a program, but is not particularly useful for "whole cloth" examination. A quasi-experimental design is another method that imposes some controls by using a time series or nonequivalent control group. The case study method has been used a great deal in writing about and evaluating faculty development (Bell, Dobson, and Gram 1977; Sweeney and Grasha 1979; Smoot 1978; Wergin, Mason, and Munson 1976; Birnbaum 1975; Kissinger 1979; Blake and Saufley 1976). The case study gives an in-depth examination of what happened and what the outcomes appear to be and sometimes suggests topics that need closer observation. The analysis describes certain effects assumed to be caused by one or more factors in the program, and the evaluation process then involves searching for those causative factors (Wergin 1977).

Wergin has listed several other evaluation techniques that are useful alone or in combination with other methods already discussed. The first is the self-evaluation portfolio, which is a collection of records and materials that broadly represent the program. Some believe this is not an objective approach to evaluation. Goal-free evaluation is another method. In this type of evaluation an outside group comes in to evaluate all outcomes without knowing the goals of the program. Finally, in the judicial evaluation, testimony is given in an open forum or hearing and a decision is reached on the value of the program by a panel composed of a cross section of the university community (Wergin 1977). But whatever type of evaluation technique is chosen, it should fit the setting and situation. Change is a subtle and complex process and is not encouraged by insensitive or arbitrary application of evaluation techniques. Evaluation is important, but it must be done with care (Bergquist and Phillips 1975b).

Postulate 15: Provide adequate funding. "It is an odd paradox that colleges that readily budget funds for the maintenance and repair of *things* (buildings, computers, typewriters) are unwilling to budget a similar amount for the maintenance of *people*" (Hammons and Wallace 1976, p. 20). An institution should set aside a certain percentage of its budget each year for faculty development.

Postulate 16: Provide critical nonmonetary support for the program. Hammons and Wallace (1976) suggest adoption of a formal board policy advocating faculty development, the president or dean taking time out to participate personally in various aspects of the program, and/or space in the president's annual report summarizing the college's faculty development program and its results.

This list is by no means exhaustive, but it does offer some sound guidelines for an institution wishing to join the growing ranks of those having faculty development programs. Institutions that have unsuccessfully tried such programs may find comfort in learning that others have encountered similar setbacks and may use this collective experience to reorganize their efforts.

Conclusions

Evidenced by the increasing volume of published information on the subject, faculty development was an important topic in the '70s and is likely to be every bit as important, if not more so, in the '80s.

The problems of budget, changing enrollments, demands for accountability, and needs of faculty members for more fulfilling personal and professional lives still remain. The literature has proposed some methods for approaching problems, some specific components of programs, and some ideas for making faculty development work. But what is clear from all this is that there is no panacea, no cure-all for the ills of the college and university instructional staff and program. Rather, each institution and each individual has to look at "my" problems, set "my" goals, and reach "my" solutions.

Bibliography

Documents available through the ERIC system appear with an ED number. To order, write to ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Va. 22210. ED numbers must be specified. All orders must be in writing and payment must accompany order. MF indicates microfiche and PC indicates paper copy.

Baratz, Morton S. "A New Retirement Age and a New Attack Upon Tenure." *A.A.U.P. Bulletin* (May 1978) 69.

Bell, M.E.; Dobson, E.C.; and Gram, J.M. "Peer Observation as a Method of Faculty Development." *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 28 (Fall 1977) 15-17.

Bergquist, William H., and Phillips, Steven R. "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program." *Journal of Higher Education* 46 (March/April 1975a) 177-211.

_____. *A Handbook for Faculty Development, Vol. 1.* Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. 1975b. ED 115 174. MF $1.06.

_____. *A Handbook for Faculty Development, Vol. 2.* Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges. 1977. ED 148 204. MF $1.06.

Bess, James L. "New Life for Faculty and Their Institutions." *Journal of Higher Education* 46 (May/June 1975) 313-325.

Birnbaum, Robert. "Using the Calendar for Faculty Development." *Educational Record* (Fall 1975) 226-230.

Blake, J. Herman, and Savitey, Ronald W. "A Case Study in Faculty Development." *Individualizing the System.* Edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. Current Issues in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

Bloom, Michael, and Freedman, Mervin. "Personal History and Professional Career." *Facilitating Faculty Development.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Centra, John A. "Faculty Development Practices." *Renewing and Evaluating Teaching.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977a.

_____. "Pluses and Minuses for Faculty Development." *Change* (December 1977b) 47-48, 64.

_____. "Faculty Development in Higher Education." *Teachers College Record* 80 (September 1978a) 188-201.

_____. "Types of Faculty Development Programs." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (1978b) 151-161.

Connell, Karen J.; Alberti, Jean A.; and Piotrowski, Zdzislaw J. "What Does It Take for Faculty Development to Make a Difference?" *Educational Horizons* 55 (Winter 1976-77) 108-115.

Davis, Robert H. "Behavioral Change: Model With Implications for Faculty Development." *Higher Education* 8 (1979) 123-140.

Eble, Kenneth Eugene, and the Conference on Career Development. *Career Development of the Effective College Teacher.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, 1971. ED 089 630. MF $1.06, PC $12.00.

Erickson, Glenn R., and Erickson, Bette L. "Improving College Teaching." *Journal of Higher Education* 50 (1979) 670-683.

Ferren, Ann S., and White, Louise G. "Models for Faculty Development." *Teaching Political Science.* 5 (October 1977) 23-38.

Francis, John Bruce. "How Do We Get There From Here?" *Facilitating Faculty Development.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Freedman, Mervin. "Facilitating Faculty Development." *Facilitating Faculty Development.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Freedman, Mervin, and Sanford, Nevitt. "The Faculty Member Yesterday and Today." *Facilitating Faculty Development.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Gaff, Jerry G. "Faculty Development: The State of the Art." *Individualizing the System.* Edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. Current Issues in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

_____. "Involving Students in Faculty Development." *Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978b.

_____. "Overcoming Faculty Resistance." *Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978b.

Gerth, Donald R. "Institutional Approaches to Faculty Development." *Facilitating Faculty Development.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1973.

Goldman, Anthony F. "The Role of Organizational Development." *Journal of Teacher Education* 29 (May/June 1978) 27-30.

Hammons, James O., and Wallace, Terry H. Smith. "Sixteen Ways to Kill a College Faculty Development Program." *Educational Technology* (December 1976) 16-20.

Heie, Harold, et al. *Professional Development Through Growth Contracts Handbook.* Wenham, Mass.: Gordon College, 1979. ED 168 405. MF $1.16, PC $10.35.

Hoyt, Donald P., and Howard, George S. "The Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs." *Research in Higher Education* 8 (1978) 25-38.

Jabker, Eugene H., and Halinski, Ronald S. "Instructional Development and Faculty Reward." *Journal of Higher Education* 49 (1978) 3, 6-328.

Kissinger, Paul B. "Operation UPDATES—A Science Program for Nonscience Faculty." *Journal of College Science Teaching* 8 (May 1979) 293-295.

Kozma, Robert B.; Belle, Lawrence W.; Williams, George W. *Instructional Techniques in Higher Education.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1978.

Kramer, Howard C. "Faculty Advising as Faculty Development." *College and University* (Spring 1979) 204-215.

Linden, Glenn. "Multi-institutional, Multi-level Faculty Development Program." *Educational Horizons* 55 (Winter 1976-77) 64-69.

Lindquist, Jack. "Social Learning and Problem-solving Strategies for Improving Academic Performance." *Evaluating Faculty Performance and Vitality.* New Directions for Institutional Research, Vol. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Marty, Myron A. "Disciplinary Associations and Faculty Development." *Individualizing the System.* Edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. Current Issues in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1976.

Mayo, G. Douglas. "Faculty Evaluation of a Faculty Development Center." *Research in Higher Education* 10 (1979) 253-262.

Mullally, Lee J., and Duffy, Norman V. "The Goal of Faculty Development: Improving Instruction (And Surviving)." *Improving College and University Teaching* 26 (Spring 1978) 121-123.

Noonan, John F. "Faculty Development Through Experimentation and Interinstitutional Cooperation." *Facilitating Faculty Development.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Nyquist, Thomas E. "State University of New York Faculty Retraining Project." *Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning* 54 (October 1978) 104-112.

Patton, Carl V. "Mid-Career Change and Early Retirement." *Evaluating Faculty Performance and Vitality.* New Directions for Institutional Research, Vol. 5. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Redditt, Paul L., and Hamilton, William T. "Teaching Improvement in a Small College." *Institutional Renewal Through the Improvement of Teaching.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Smith, Albert B. *Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education.* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1976. ED 132 891. MF $1.06, PC $8.70.

Smith, Ralph B., and Ovard, Glen F. "Professional Development: A New Approach." *Improving College and University Teaching* 27 (Winter 1979) 40-46.

Smoot, Joseph G. "Faculty Development and Evaluation at a Small University." *Improving College and University Teaching* (Winter 1978) 87-88.

Stice, James E. "A Bargain at Any Price: A Steal @ $1.24." *Educational Horizons* 55 (Winter 1976-77) 80-85.

Sweeney, John M., and Grasha, Anthony F. "Improving Teaching Through Faculty Development Triads." *Educational Technology* (February 1979) 54-57.

Webb, Jeaninne, and Smith, Albert B. "Improving Instruction in Higher Education." *Educational Horizons* 55 (Winter 1976-77) 86-91.

Wergin, Jon F. "Evaluating Faculty Development Programs." *Renewing and Evaluating Teaching.* New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.

Wergin, Jon F.; Mason, Elizabeth J.; and Munson, Paul J. "The Practice of Faculty Development: An Experience-derived Model." *Journal of Higher Education* 47 (May/June 1976) 289-307.